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1-minute summary

• Urban Landscape
  – India is also urbanizing away from smaller towns and across the countryside

• Government Support: JNNURM Across the Spectrum
  – JNNURM money was not just for large cities, though it was concentrated in bigger cities and the larger small towns

• Large Cities
  – Cities may not be as emancipatory as believed. Caste and services are unequally distributed spatially

• Cities of Delhi
  – Space matters. The type of settlement — planned colony, JJC, unauthorized colony, resettlement colony, etc. — determines the degree of ‘citizenship’
  – State actions themselves may be producing inequality
Urban Landscape

Unacknowledged Urbanisation: The New Census Towns of India Economic & Political Weekly, 7 September 2013

Kanhu Charan Pradhan
Urban growth is not just in large cities

Share of Urban Population by Type of Urban Area

- Million Plus Towns
- 1L-10L Towns
- Census Towns
- Other Urban Areas

2001 | 2011_New | 2011_Old
---|---|---
Million Plus Towns | 25.6% | 25.3% | 24.3%
1L-10L Towns | 34.1% | 25.3% | 2.6%
Census Towns | 7.4% | 8.2% | 0.9%
Other Urban Areas | 32.9% | 25.6% | 0.9%
Urban growth under rural administration

- Kerala: 97%
- West Bengal: 69%
- Jharkhand: 45%
- Orissa: 39%
- Tamil Nadu: 39%
- NCT of Delhi: 33%
- Andhra Pradesh: 30%
- Punjab: 24%
- Uttar Pradesh: 22%
- Rajasthan: 21%
- Maharashtra: 21%
- Haryana: 18%
- Bihar: 14%
- Gujarat: 13%
- Karnataka: 13%
- Madhya Pradesh: 10%
- Chhattisgarh: 4%

India: 32.8%
Urban Landscape is spread across India

Distribution of Urban Areas 2001  Distribution of Urban Areas 2011
Takeaway: Smaller is important too

New and Old Urban Areas

Take away

• Urban growth is not happening only in large cities
  – In fact, growth in the core metropolis is slowing down
  – Increase in some peripheries
• Instead, new urban areas are coming up all over India
  – Most of the new towns in 2011 are census towns
• The population share of smaller towns is growing
  – Share of census towns has doubled
Government Support: JNNURM Across the Spectrum


Sama Khan
JNNURM across the Spectrum

Allocations by size-class vis-à-vis population

Note: Census towns are those that attained statutory status between 2001 and 2005. Only urban local bodies were eligible to receive funding under JNNURM.
## The Other JNNURM: UIDSSMT and IHSDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme/Towns</th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
<th>Class V</th>
<th>Class VI</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UIDSSMT</strong></td>
<td>79 (5%)</td>
<td>99 (2%)</td>
<td>178 (2%)</td>
<td>126 (1%)</td>
<td>46 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (0%)</td>
<td>539 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHSDP</strong></td>
<td>89 (6%)</td>
<td>95 (2%)</td>
<td>187 (2%)</td>
<td>108 (0%)</td>
<td>42 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>535 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns included in both UIDSSMT and IHSDP</strong></td>
<td>107 (9%)</td>
<td>106 (2%)</td>
<td>85 (1%)</td>
<td>31 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>340 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (UIDSSMT + IHSDP)</strong></td>
<td>275 (20%)</td>
<td>300 (6%)</td>
<td>450 (4%)</td>
<td>265 (1%)</td>
<td>98 (0%)</td>
<td>26 (0%)</td>
<td>1414 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Towns</strong></td>
<td>421 (29%)</td>
<td>545 (10%)</td>
<td>1315 (13%)</td>
<td>1088 (4%)</td>
<td>474 (1%)</td>
<td>133 (0%)</td>
<td>3976 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Towns</strong></td>
<td>20 (1%)</td>
<td>54 (1%)</td>
<td>591 (5%)</td>
<td>1141 (4%)</td>
<td>1713 (3%)</td>
<td>366 (0%)</td>
<td>3885 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Note:** The first number in the cell indicates the number of towns and the percentage in parentheses represents the percentage of total urban population. Statutory towns exclude the 65 cities under UIG and BSUP. Some census towns that were converted into urban local bodies by 2005 were included under UIDSSMT and IHSDP.

**Source:** UIG and UIDSSMT data as on March 2014, BSUP data as on August 2015, IHSDP data as on June 2015, Census 2011
Takeaway: The focus is still on large cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACA</th>
<th>UIG</th>
<th>UIDSSMT</th>
<th>BSUP</th>
<th>IHSDP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21616</td>
<td><strong>21493</strong></td>
<td>11217</td>
<td><strong>6086</strong></td>
<td>60412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td><strong>36%</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12730</td>
<td><strong>12674</strong></td>
<td>11461</td>
<td><strong>6571</strong></td>
<td>43436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BSUP and IHSDP schemes have a higher utilisation ratio
  - Is it because they were not reform linked?
- New schemes such as Smart Cities and AMRUT explicitly focus on the larger towns

- The release criteria for smaller towns, under UIDSSMT and BSUP are more front-ended than UIG and IHSDP
- Yes, releases are more than commitments in BSUP and IHSDP!
Large Cities: Looking Within


Pranav Sidhwani
The ‘Outliers’ in Large Cities

- ‘Outliers’ are wards in cities with a statistically large share of SC/ST population
  - Outliers have values greater than the third quartile + 1.5 times the interquartile range, i.e.
    these are wards where the proportion of SC/STs is very high relative to the city
- To gain a better understanding of where the “richest” wards stand in this distribution, car
  ownership was taken as a proxy of wealth and an average number calculated for every variable
  under study for the top 10% wards in terms of the proportion of households with a car. These
  numbers are represented by the red dot in the boxplots.
### Large Cities: What are the ‘Outliers’ like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total No. of Wards</th>
<th>No. of outlier wards</th>
<th>Share of SC/STs in outlier wards</th>
<th>SC/ST Proportion</th>
<th>Households without In house latrines</th>
<th>Households with Two wheeler (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outlier Wards</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Outlier Wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmedabad</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pune</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In some cities, a large proportion of the SC/ST population is concentrated in the outlier wards. A clear pattern with respect to basic (latrine) and ‘luxury’ (two-wheeler) amenities is not visible across all cities.
Gorard’s Index of Segregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male Literacy</th>
<th>SC/ST</th>
<th>In-house drinking water</th>
<th>In-house latrine</th>
<th>Two wheeler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmedabad</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pune</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of ‘segregation’ for SC/ST is less than that observed for race in the United States. ‘Segregation’ is even higher for amenities like in-house latrines and water.
## Large Cities: Take Away

### Correlation of share of SC/ST and other amenities across wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>(SC/ST - IHW)</th>
<th>(SC/ST - IHL)</th>
<th>(SC/ST - TW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmedabad</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pune</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Figures in parenthesis are negative.  
2. Figures in bold are significant at 5%.

### Take away

- SC/ST Communities are spatially segregated
- But, in many cities, service provision is even more spatially concentrated
- Service provision is often worse where there is a concentration of SC/ST populations
- Bottom line: Space Matters and caste may matter still
Cities of Delhi

Subhadra Banda, Varsha Bhaik, Patrick Heller, Bijendra Jha, Ben Mandelkern, Partha Mukhopadhyay, Ram Pravesh Shahi, Sonal Sharma, Shahana Sheikh, David Adler (External researcher)

http://citiesofdelhi.cprindia.org/
The many Cities of Delhi

• Places
  – JJC: F-Block Punjabi Basti, Indira Kalyan Vihar, Anant Ram Dairy Harijan Basti, Kusumpur Pahari, Jai Hind Camp, Sanjay Camp
  – RC: Savda-Ghewra, Madanpur Khadar, Mangolpuri
  – UAC: Sangam Vihar
  – R-UAC: Mandavali

• Processes
  – Resettlement, Eviction, Regularisation, In-situ redevelopment

• Institutions
  – DJB, DUSIB, DDA

• Places document the status and history of the settlement, the level and quality of services, and how the residents of the city interact with their elected representatives, state agencies, and other agents in securing public services.

• Processes through which the governing institutions of Delhi engage with residents, examining both the legal and policy prescriptions that govern these interventions, as well as the actual interventions on the ground.

• Institutions of governance in Delhi, documenting their legal framework, structure, policies, and activities.
Ten Inequality Producing Actions in Delhi

- **First**, DDA builds for the relatively rich and not for the poor
- **Second**, people cannot formally develop land for housing
- **Third**, courts often do not recognise rights of residents of JJCs. By one reading, courts in Delhi have been a demolition machine
- **Fourth**, the state uses the law to constrict employment options, by relocation of industry
- **Fifth**, it impedes the progress of even the few relocated JJC residents by peripheralising the location and reducing the plot size in RCs
- **Sixth**, services remain poor in RCs, despite being legal and planned settlements,
- **Seventh**, in some UACs, the residents have to depend on an extensive private piped network; distributing water from borewells, which is more expensive, poorer in quality and limited in supply
- **Eighth**, JJCs in Delhi that are often demolished to ostensibly build infrastructure like roads, flyovers and the Delhi metro rail bear the brunt of the costs, but the benefits disproportionately accrue to privileged households
- **Ninth**, agencies like DJB exclude existing UACs and JJCs from their network plans, due to their ‘illegal’ status
- **Tenth**, transport investment in Delhi is skewed towards the metro railway, which accounted for 86% of the plan investment in sector in 2013-14

Source: State Produced Inequality in an Indian City Seminar August 2015 PATRICK HELLER and PARTHA MUKHOPADHYAY
Questions

• Is the current process of urbanisation inevitably dis-equalising?
  — To the extent that it is exacerbated by the state, changes in policy can improve matters

• Is appropriate data being collected and analysed to come up with solutions?
  — Data is not organised spatially in India and when it is, it is hard to access for researchers
  — Government is not capacitated to use it

• Is the city sufficiently salient politically?
Thank you

http://www.cprindia.org/urbanisation
http://citiesofdelhi.cprindia.org/
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